UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/991,804	11/19/2001	Travis J. Parry	10008076-1	5590

7590   03/23/2006

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO   80527-2400

EXAMINER
LEE, TOMMY D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2625	

DATE MAILED: 03/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/991,804	PARRY, TRAVIS J.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thomas D. Lee	2625	.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09 January 2006</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1.   This Office action is responsive to applicant's amendment filed January 9, 2006.

Claims 1-20 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can

be found in a prior Office action.

3.   Claims 1-3, 5-10 and 12-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,078,400 (Mizutani) in view of U.S. Patent 5,845,057

(Takeda et al., hereinafter Takeda).

Regarding claim 1, Mizutani discloses an imaging device comprising: a processor

adapted to compile error information when an error is detected, wherein the error is

based on one or more imaging device processes (error detecting device detects an

error in processes (column 7, lines 28-31)); a print engine coupled to the processor and

adapted to produce tangible output images (image data generating device analyzes

print data from print control device, and generates image data such as bitmap data

(column 7, lines 8-17)); and a storage device coupled to the processor, wherein the

processor is adapted to store the error information for one or more of transmission,

retrieval, and disposal of the error information based on user criteria (image data storing

device stores image data as error information, which is sent by error information

sending device to client apparatuses (column 7, lines 32-37)).

Regarding claim 8, Mizutani discloses a method of error archiving for an imaging device, comprising: monitoring system operations for the imaging device (error detecting device detects an error in processes (column 7, lines 28-31)); when an error is detected, compiling information about the error into an error file for one or more of storage, transmission, retrieval, and disposal (image data storing device stores image data as error information (column 7, lines 32-37)).

Claims 1 and 8 have been amended to indicate that error information for two or more errors are stored in the storage device or error file. While this limitation is not disclosed in Mizutani, Takeda discloses a document management table and error detection table that store error information for two or more errors (noting Fig. 12, error information stored under EXECUTION STATE for documents 1 and 2; noting Fig. 13, error information stored for four different types of errors). Providing tables for storing error information enables a user to more easily keep track of the occurrence of errors during print processing when a number of print jobs are being performed, and thus these errors can be more easily traced to a specific problem and corrected. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill to modify the teaching of Mizutani by providing tables for storing error information for the detection of errors, as disclosed in Takeda.

Regarding claims 10 and 14, Mizutani further discloses transmitting the compiled error information to an output device or associated imaging device administration program (error information sent by error information sending device to client apparatuses (column 7, lines 32-37)).

Claims 15 and 18 recite a computer-usable medium for performing the method

steps recited in above-rejected 8 and 14, respectively. Mizutani discloses such a

medium (CD-ROM, floppy disk or the like (column 11, lines 1-11)).

Mizutani does not disclose error information comprising user error information

and administrator error information, including the location where the error occurred, the

type of error detected, and one or more of the program address where the error

occurred, contents of the file being processed when the error occurred, sequence of

events that led up to the error, type of file being processed when the error occurred,

size of the file being processed when the error occurred, and a stack trace, as recited in

claims 2, 5 and 6, and as similarly recited in claims 9, 12, 16 and 19; determining

correction procedures based on the detected error, as recited in claims 13 and 20; or

printing the compiled error information, as recited in claim 17. Takeda discloses a print

processing method for a plurality of printing apparatuses connected to a network,

wherein a report sheet image is generated, showing, in addition to a name of a

substitute printing apparatus, a current state of the apparatus having an error, measures

to remove the error, etc. (read Abstract). The report sheet image displays user and

administrator error information (column 9, line 32 – column 10, line 53; Figs. 8-11)).

The error information disclosed in Mizutani comprising image data recorded when the

error occurred, and thus does not inform a user of the type of error that has taken place.

By providing a report sheet as disclosed in Takeda, a user can easily determine why an

error occurred, and thus determine how to remedy the situation. Therefore, it would

have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teaching of Mizutani

by providing a printout of user and administrator error information, as disclosed in

Takeda.

Regarding claim 3, Mizutani further discloses a control panel coupled to the

processor and adapted to enable access of the error information (error information may

be alternatively displayed according to user's selection (column 10, lines 32-36)).

Regarding claim 7, Mizutani does not disclose the type of image data storing

device used for storing the error information. However, one of ordinary skill in the art

would have recognized that any type of storage device capable of storing data may be

used, with equal effect, for storing the error information disclosed in Mizutani, and thus it

would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to provide a storage device

such as an SRAM, DRAM, non-volatile memory, register, magnetic media and optical

media, in Mizutani for storing error information.

4.   Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizutani

in view of Takeda as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent

5,956,487 (Venkatraman et al., hereinafter Venkatraman).

Mizutani in view of Takeda does not disclose an embedded web server coupled

to the processor, wherein the embedded web server is adapted to interface between the

processor and one or more user-identified addresses. Venkatraman discloses an

embedded web access mechanism for user interface functions including a web server

and web browser, enabling a user to access a web page by a web browser (read

Abstract). With a web server embedded within a device that has experienced an error

or malfunction, a user is able to contact a web site that offers service or support, so that

the user may obtain information for resolving the error or malfunction without delay.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the

combined teaching of Mizutani and Takeda by providing an embedded web server, as

disclosed in Venkatraman.

5.   Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizutani

in view of Takeda as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent

6,108,099 (Ohtani).

        Neither Mizutani nor Takeda disclose transmitting administration error

information to one or more user-designated addresses, wherein the one or more user

designated address comprise one or more e-mail addresses, web addresses, printer

addresses, facsimile addresses, and http addresses, as recited in claim 11. Ohtani

discloses an image forming apparatus and management system, wherein an address of

a predetermined network terminal is stored in memory, and an e-mail is produced by the

image forming apparatus and sent to the network terminal when an abnormal condition

is detected (read Abstract). By providing such a feature, a user is able to contact a

supplier immediately when an abnormal condition occurs, without having to manually

generate an order, thereby minimizing the amount of time the device is inoperable due

to the abnormal condition. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary

skill in the art to modify the combined teaching of Mizutani and Takeda by providing

transmission of administration error information, such as disclosed in Ohtani.

Response to Arguments

6.   Applicant's arguments, see pages 6-7 of current amendment, filed January 9, 2006, with respect to the rejection of claims 15-20 under 35 U.S.C. 101 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of these claims has been withdrawn.

7.   Applicant's arguments filed in response to the rejection of claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) or 103(a) as set forth in the prior Office action have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claims 1, 3, 8, 10, 14, 15 and 18, applicant asserts that Mizutani does not teach or disclose an imaging device that is adapted to compile the error information when an error is detected and store in a storage device or error file the error information for two or more errors (see current amendment, pages 7-8). This limitation, which has been amended onto base claims 1, 8 and 15, is disclosed in Takeda, as mentioned above.

Regarding claims 2, 4-7, 9, 11-13, 16, 17, 19 and 20, applicant asserts that these claims are in condition for allowance in view of their dependence from base claims 1, 8 or 15, which applicant states are patentably distinct from the cited references (see current amendment, pages 9-11). The claims are, in fact, not patentably distinct, for all of the limitations recited in these claims are either disclosed or suggested by the cited references, for the reasons set forth above. While applicant provides a brief description of the cited references, the applicant does not set forth specific deficiencies in the references that would lead to the conclusion the claims should be allowed.

Conclusion

8.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas D. Lee whose telephone number is (571) 272-7436. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 7:30-5:00, alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David K. Moore can be reached on (571) 272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Thomas D Lee
Primary Examiner
Technology Division 2625

tdl
March 14, 2006